

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

KASTURI HALDAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME DU
LAC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-CV-836-CCB-SJF

ORDER

Ripe before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Sur-Reply in Further Opposition to Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Reconsideration. (ECF 57). Defendants filed a redacted version of their proposed surreply as an exhibit to their instant motion (ECF 57-1) along with an unredacted version under seal (ECF 58). Defendants then filed a motion to seal the unredacted version of their proposed surreply. (ECF 59).

This Court's local rules permit parties to file a supporting brief, a response, and a reply, but do not contemplate surreplies in response to a reply brief. *Lafayette Life Ins. Co. v. City of Menasha, Wis.*, No. 4:09 cv 64, [2010 WL 4553667](#), at *1 (N.D. Ind. Nov. 3, 2010). "The decision to permit the filing of a surreply is purely discretionary and should generally be allowed only for valid reasons, such as when the movant raises new arguments in a reply brief" with consideration of whether the surreply could make a

difference in the outcome of the matter before the court. *Meraz-Camacho v. United States*, 417 F. App'x 558, 559 (7th Cir. 2011).

Despite Plaintiff's arguments to the contrary, Defendants have demonstrated valid reasons for submitting a surreply. Defendants have also demonstrated good cause to maintain portions of its surreply under seal with no objection by Plaintiff. See *Citizens First Nat'l Bank of Princeton v. Cincinnati Ins. Co.*, 178 F.3d 943, 944 (7th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, both Defendants' motion for leave to file a surreply (ECF 57) and their accompanying motion to seal the unredacted version of the surreply (ECF 59) are **GRANTED**. Defendants' surreply, filed both in redacted (ECF 57-1) and unredacted (ECF 58) form, is deemed timely filed. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to maintain the unredacted version of the surreply under seal. (ECF 58).

Plaintiff may file a surrebuttal to Defendants' surreply if filed no later than **April 2, 2025**. No further briefing of Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF 36) will be considered.

SO ORDERED on March 26, 2025.

/s/ Cristal C. Brisco
CRISTAL C. BRISCO, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT